New Railway Lines.

Q.—111. Srimathi B. L. SUBBAMMA (Chikmagalur-Mudigere).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the Central Government, while undertaking the construction of new railway lines, have asked the State Governments to intimate the lines required for the State ;

(*b*) if so, the railway lines recommended by the State Government ?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) 1. Hassan-Mangalore Railway Line.
2. Chamarajanagar-Sathyamangalam.
3. Chitaldrug-Rayadrug, and
4. Kadur-Chikmagalur-Mangalore.

ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

(1) Employees in the Electric Department (aftermath of strike.)

1 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri S. Gopala Gowda has given notice of a motion for adjournment of the business of the House as follows :—

"This Assembly do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance to wit : the situation arising out of the refusal of the Electrical Department to take in a large number of employees on duty and the indiscriminate and vindictive transfers of the employees of the same department after the ending of the strike."

As Hon'ble Members are aware, a number of rulings given in past sessions in this Assembly has laid down clearly that when an ordinary Parliamentary opportunity will occur shortly or in time, an adjournment motion has to be disallowed as wanting in urgency. We are not alone in such a view but are merely following precedents laid down in other Legislatures also. The reason for such a point of view is that there would be no need to interrupt appointed business when the subject matter of adjournment motion could be debated within the limits of such appointed business whether immediately or in time. Hon'ble Members have such opportunity during the debate on the Motion of Thanks and later during general debate on the Budget.

Hon'ble Members will appreciate that the objection to admissibility is on the ground of want of "urgency." It does not matter that the matter is of public importance. A matter may be of great public importance but it may be still inadmissible for want of urgency.

For these reasons I hold that the motion is not admissible.

I may add that a detailed ruling about adjournment motions in general was given on 11th March 1953 and extract from a ruling of the Speaker of Parliament in 1950 was also circulated. I shall however get another statement prepared and circulated among members shortly.

---

(2) Mass evictions of Tenants in Shimoga District.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri S. Gopala Gowda and Sri Mulka Govinla Reddy have given notice of an adjournment motion as follows :—

"This Assembly do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance to wit : the situation arising out of the mass evictions of tenants that are being resorted to by the landlords in Shimoga District."

For the reasons I have given in respect of an adjournment motion I disallowed earlier, I must hold that this adjournment motion is also not admissible There is further this objection that there is nothing to indicate when this "emergency" if any, arose, what is the extent of evictions, and how the matter is of public importance. I hold therefore that this motion is also out of order.